

95-176

RECEIVED

From: <RILEYJIMH@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(sseal)
Date: 12/22/95 8:20am
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

JAN - 5 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

James Riley (RILEYJIMH@aol.com) writes:

1. My eyes nearly popped of my head at the cost figures of \$2000-\$5000 & 20-30 Man-hours per hour of tv captioning. Just think if legal stenos were paid at that rate ? Who would be in court if lawyers were billing at a portionitally higher rate ?

I must read the NOI for more info. The only "captioned" video that I've seen has been on PBS or C-SPAN and wasn't overly impressed with the informational content that I read. Of course, I've never been accused of brevity in speech or writing !

The C-SPAN CAPTIONING has improved greatly over this last year.

2. Small complaint: Some of the on-line providers tend to treat their customers like a certain phone company or IRS used to treat their customers.

Sincerely,

James H Riley

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: www-e3.proxy.aol.com
Remote IP address: 152.163.193.4

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

95-176

RECEIVED

JAN - 5 1996

From: <mbehrent@tpo.org>
To: A4.A4(ssega)
Date: 12/24/95 1:03pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Michael John Behrent (mbehrent@tpo.org) writes:

Chairman Hundt,

The absolute MOST the Government should do is grant tax and/or licensing breaks to those companies who provide these extra services to the disabled and handicapped. To mandate private industry bear the cost and red tape of these advances in access is beyond the bounds of it's constituted authority.

If there is a commercial market, it will be filled. Government mandate is a violation of the limits put on the Federal Government by Constitutional authority. It's akin to the Government mandating HDTV regardless of practical considerations, public need, or desirability. I would hope the FCC has more sense and integrity than to issue such regulations that put an uncalled for burden on every citizen.

Regards;

Michael J. Behrent (N9NCR)

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: Remote IP address: 199.201.105.102

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

95-176

From: <hank@hank.com>
To: A4.A4(ssega1)
Date: 12/25/95 5:26pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN - 5 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Prof. Henry C. Armstrong III (hank@hank.com) writes:

I support your views on closed captioning.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: pm135.smartlink.net
Remote IP address: 204.118.4.135

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

95-176

RECEIVED

JAN - 5 1996

From: <hleong@localnet.com>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 12/26/95 2:36pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Harvey Leong (hleong@localnet.com) writes:

Closed caption is an important aid to hearing impaired. My wife and I appreciate programs that have closed captions.

As America ages, so will all the "boomers".

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: ppp4.conn.localnet.com
Remote IP address: 206.42.107.36

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

95-176

RECEIVED

JAN - 5 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <jtinberg@emi.net>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 12/26/95 9:19pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

John Tinberg (jtinberg@emi.net) writes:

Your first step towards solutions must begin by realizing that you have enjoined the Federal Government in micro-managing the enterprises that you have no idea how to finance nor run as a corporation.

Your regulations have been so misrepresented that your bureau has ruined countless of lives by the power vested in your agency so mistakenly.

You are so obviously given in by your favorites that the 1996 Presidential campaign will reveal your pre-occupations into a mistaken world of bureaus that run everything into the ground.

In other words, Mr. Hundt, We can only hope that a Republican success will result in your unemployment. It is only fitting since you have caused so much of the same.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: ttyEF.emi.net
Remote IP address: 204.181.45.173

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

95-176

From: <rmiller@us.net>
To: A4.A4(ssegal)
Date: 1/2/96 1:00am
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments

RECEIVED

JAN - 5 1996

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY**

D. Richard Miller (rmiller@us.net) writes:

Dear Chairman Hundt:

Thanks for the opportunity to correspond with you.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I have a couple of comments on the NOI dealing with accessibility of programming to deaf people and blind people. It is probably not advisable to require all content providers to include closed captioning and video description for their programming. I think that the reasons are not solely economic, but also artistic. Here are a couple of considerations:

1. Many programs are inappropriate for video description and maybe even closed captioning. The information rate of a combined video and audio program are far beyond that of scrolling text or even descriptive speech - that's why we have television!

2. How will the law specify the adequacy of closed captioning or video description? Must every word uttered appear in closed captioning? How much of a scene must be described in order for a program to be compliant? It seems to me that this will be extremely subjective. If the law is too strict, it could be considered an infringement of first amendment rights of content providers since it will artificially limit the information rate of their programs, and therefore their ability to freely express themselves.

3. What about small markets with few disabled persons? Will they be subject to the same constraints as all other providers?

As I'm sure you are aware, this could be a real Pandora's box. Yet the disabled community should not be ignored. Let's try looking at it from the consumer's point of view, rather than the provider's. There are about 80 channels available in my house. Two of them broadcast exclusively in languages other than english. I don't watch those channels. Three or four of my channels are text only with some kind of non-essential sound track. Sometimes I watch those channels if their content interests me. What have these examples to do with access for the disabled? While I could, theoretically, learn Japanese, Farsi, Arabic, and Spanish, it is unlikely that I will, so the audio portions of these channels are essentially inaccessible for me, just as english language programs are inaccessible for non-english speaking people, and all audio tracks are inaccessible for the deaf. Yet the channels coexist on the same cable with their own audiences. Maybe the answer for the disabled is to require a certain number of channels or programs be accessible to them, rather than all of them.

What's wrong with a channel that is video only for the deaf? Or a TV (radio would make more sense) station with audio only for the blind?

Don't burden all programming with accessibility requirements that limit the information rate which is the whole reason for the existence of the medium.

Thanks for reading this :)
Rick Miller

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: endD5.laurel.us.net
Remote IP address: 198.240.112.144

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

95-176

From: Sheryl Segal
To: 95-176
Date: 2/5/96 12:54pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments -Reply

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

FEB 5 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

>>> <trohl@au.oro.net> 01/13/96 12:45am >>>
Anthony Rohl (trohl@pop3.oro.net) writes:

The Americans with Disabilities certainly was a watershed event. More than a watershed, it was a tidalwave that buried American business in even more burdensome regulation. But I digress. Closed captioning is a beneficial service to a lot of people, senior citizens like myself included who don't hear the full sound spectrum anymore.

What I don't quite understand is the rumored intent to sell for billions of dollars more of the ether. as we used to call it. Is there ANYTHING that occurs in nature that the government doesn't seek to pin a price tag on?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: trohl.oro.net
Remote IP address: 204.119.229.66

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____